

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the November 17, 2003 Office Action. In that action, claims 28-30, 32, 33, and 42-56 were pending and all of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious in light of the combination of Nadeau (USPN 6,240,449), Smyk (USPN 6,161,128), White (USPN 6,021,126), and Swartz (USPN 6,445,694).

Claims 28, 42, and 51 have been amended to further distinguish over the prior art of record. New claims 57-60 have been added. Reconsideration of the rejections and examination of the new claims is hereby requested.

The claims pending at the time of the most recent Office Action were all rejected based on a combination of Nadeau, Smyk, White, and Swartz. It appears that each of these references is deficient with regard to the following limitation, which also appears in the new claims. There is a list of destination addresses associated with authorized subscribers that are stored in a database, the list including a plurality of destination addresses that each represent a different means for communication with the subscriber.

Nadeau appears to disclose a method and apparatus for placing telephone calls via the Internet. As described in Nadeau at column 9, lines 19-24, a subscriber first builds a directory of the individuals he or she wishes to be able to reach. The directory includes some routing information for each entry. Thus, for example, it appears that subscriber Katianne may set up a directory of individuals she wishes to be able to call. Continuing with the example, a subscriber named Katianne may create for entries people she might wish to call such as for Kory, Rachel, and Dylan. (Of course, the undersigned has made up names for ease of explanation.) Each of

these entries for Kory, Rachel, and Dylan would include routing information so that when Katianne sought to call Rachel, for example, the directory would provide information as to where the call to Rachel should be routed. Most importantly, there is no mention in Nadeau of a subscriber such as Katianne creating a plurality of destination addresses for herself, with each destination address representing a different means for communicating with her, such as a home phone number, work phone number, mobile phone number, fax phone number, and so forth, and further, where calls placed to her mobile phone should be routed.

It appears that each of Smyk, White, and Swartz have this same deficiency. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify one or the combination of these references to come up with this claimed limitation. The Examiner is requested to provide a reference showing why curing such a deficiency would be obvious, should the Examiner disagree with the statement above. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are patentable in view of the cited references.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: _____
Robert G. Crouch, Esq.
Registration No. 34,806
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
Telephone: (720) 562-5506
Facsimile: (303) 338-1514

Date: February 17, 2004